

1 *Approved February 28, 2008*

2
3 Library of California Board Meeting

4 August 8, 2007

5
6 California State Library
7 914 Capitol Mall, Room 500
8 Sacramento, California

9
10 **CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS**

11
12 President Paymaneh Maghsoudi convened the Library of California Board Meeting on
13 August 8, 2007 at 9:00 a.m., by asking Member Kastanis to lead those in attendance in
14 the Pledge of Allegiance. President Maghsoudi then welcomed Board Members, staff and
15 audience members to Sacramento and called for introductions.

16
17 **Board Members Present:** President Paymaneh Maghsoudi, Vice-President Penny
18 Kastanis, Dr. Conchita Battle, Tyrone Cannon, Victoria Fong, Linda Jewett, Jane
19 Lowenthal, Susan Steinhauser and Judy Zollman.

20
21 **California State Library Staff Present:** State Librarian Susan Hildreth, Deputy State
22 Librarian Stacey Aldrich, Mimi Morris, Tom Andersen, Gerry Maginnity, Sandy
23 Habbestad, Chris Berger, Rush Brandis, Ira Bray, Jacquie Brinkley, Suzanne Flint,
24 Richard Hall, Susan Hanks, Carla Lehn, Kathy Low, Cindy Mediavilla, Kevin Saunders,
25 and Cindy Tackett.

26
27 **ADOPTION OF AGENDA**

28
29 *It was moved, seconded (Fong/Kastanis) and carried unanimously that the*
30 *Library of California Board adopts the agenda of the August 8, 2007 meeting*
31 *as presented.*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved, seconded (Cannon/Zollman) and carried unanimously that the draft minutes of the April 18, 2007 Library of California Board meeting be approved as corrected.

RATIFICATION OF LIBRARY OF CALIFORNIA BOARD ACTIONS

It was moved, seconded (Steinhauser/Fong) and carried unanimously that the Library of California Board ratifies actions taken at the April 18, 2007 meeting.

RESOLUTIONS

Member Lowenthal read a Board resolution in honor of Barbara Will and several members spoke with fond memories in praise of Barbara’s character and contributions to the State Library and the library community.

It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Kastanis) and carried unanimously that the Library of California Board adopts Library of California Board Resolution 2007-03 for Barbara Will. (See Attachment A)

REPORTS TO THE BOARD

Chief Executive Officer’s Report

Susan Hildreth began by introducing the new State Library staff members to the Board. She first introduced Mimi Morris who has been at the library since July. Morris is to be the next Chief of Administrative Services when Andrew St. Mary retires at the end

1 of September. Hildreth welcomed Morris and asked her to tell those present a little about
2 her background.

3

4 Morris stated that she recently had come from a division of the Governor's office that
5 was responsible for administering the federal Americorp Program. She had been there
6 about nine years as their Chief Financial Officer. Before that she had been at the Center
7 for California Studies at California State University in Sacramento. She had been
8 Assistant Director for Budget and Director of the Assembly Fellowship Program. Before
9 that she had been with a division of the Office of Governor George Deukmejian handling
10 liaison with Mexico. Morris concluded by saying that she brought with her an extensive
11 experience and was very happy to be a part of the State Library and was looking forward
12 to working with everyone.

13

14 Hildreth then introduced Stacey Aldrich, the new Deputy State Librarian. She
15 indicated that Aldrich had already been involved in California and had made a favorable
16 impression on staff, as she had been one of the outstanding presenters at Infopeople's
17 Executive Leadership Institute. Hildreth thanked Governor Swartzenegger and his
18 administration for appointing the individual she saw as the most competitive candidate
19 for the position of Deputy State Librarian.

20

21 Aldrich addressed the Board saying she was happy to be in California. Previously, she
22 had been at the Omaha Public Library where she had been the Assistant Director for
23 about one and a half years. Before that she had been with the State Library in Maryland
24 for about nine years. In between, she had taken a break and worked for Coates & Jarratt,
25 Inc., a futuring think-tank in Washington D.C. She pointed out that she has had
26 experience thinking on the library side, and a little bit on the outside, thinking newly,
27 differently and innovatively with lots of good people who could work with librarians and
28 Board members in thinking about the future and developing new programs and initiatives
29 that would benefit the citizens of California. She thanked everyone and expressed that she
30 was excited to be here and that she was looking forward to working with everyone.

31

1 After pointing out the heavy work-load in Library Development Services, which had a
2 leaner LSTA staff as compared to other states, Hildreth announced that Sandy Habbestad
3 had been appointed Operations Manager for LDS, following a recruitment for that
4 position. She reassured the Board that Habbestad would continue serving as the CSL staff
5 person for the LoC Board.

6
7 With a lot going on at the State Library and the addition of new staff, Hildreth
8 predicted that there probably would be a number of initiatives occurring in the next year
9 or so. But at present the library was still making preparations. She said that a lot of action
10 would be taken pending approval of the state budget. But as of this date a budget had not
11 yet been passed.

12
13 Hildreth explained that the Library of California Board meetings had been scheduled
14 for August, because in the past the state budget often had been passed by then. With a
15 definite budget the Board could make decisions. But another reason for scheduling it for
16 August this year was in anticipation of submitting a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) for
17 one of the CLSA programs. Because the Board must understand and support some of the
18 directions the State Library is taking, the State Library needed to share that with the
19 Board before the BCP submission deadline to the Department of Finance on September
20 15th. Hildreth stated that BCPs would be discussed later in the meeting today. Statewide
21 Reference would also be discussed later in the day, Hildreth indicated. She apologized to
22 anyone who had come from around the state for that purpose. There would not be a lot to
23 report at this meeting because the State Library was still trying to implement a workplan
24 and recruit a project manager.

25
26 **ELECTION OF BOARD OFFICERS FOR 2008**

27
28 President Maghsoudi referred to Members Steinhauser and Fong, Chair and Co-Chair
29 respectively of the Nominating Committee, for their Election of Board Officer report.

30 Member Steinhauser reported that after much reflection and discussion she and
31 Member Fong decided to nominate Member Kastanis for Board President and Member

1 Cannon for Vice President. Each Member had many years of library experience; Member
2 Kastanis with youth K-12 and Member Cannon with college undergraduate through post-
3 graduate levels. Although Member Cannon lacked the years of experience on the Board
4 that Member Kastanis had, he had just received his E.D.D in Education, focusing on
5 Information Literacy and the Digital Divide. Member Cannon may readily apply the
6 many issues coming out of academia to the public, the school and the private sectors.
7 Together the Members would cover librarianship entirely.

8
9 *It was moved by the Nominating Committee (Steinhauser) and carried*
10 *unanimously that the Library of California Board elects Penny Kastanis*
11 *as President of the Library of California Board for the year 2008.*

12
13 *It was moved by the Nominating Committee (Steinhauser) and carried*
14 *unanimously that the Library of California Board elects Tyronne*
15 *Cannon as Vice-President of the Library of California Board for the*
16 *year 2008.*

17
18 **Library of California Board meeting schedule and locations**

19
20 Sandy Habbestad reported that in June she had surveyed Board Members about
21 possible meeting dates for a one-day meeting in late February or early March and a one-
22 day meeting in August. The survey results showed that some of the members were
23 limited in their availability. However, staff recommended that the Board secure the dates
24 for February 28th and August 7th for its meetings in 2008, and that both meetings be held
25 in Sacramento. After much discussion, Board Members agreed to the recommended
26 dates.

27
28 **Budget and Planning Report**

1 President Maghsoudi stated that there was a revised Document 6: CLSA Baseline
2 Budget. Andersen explained that it was added as a contingency if the State Budget was
3 not passed by the time the Board met.

4
5 Member Steinhauser posed a question about the \$1.6 million budget item for System
6 Reference and whether it would have a bearing on the Statewide Reference Proposal to
7 be discussed later in the day.

8
9 Hildreth responded by saying that the Statewide Reference Proposal would not have a
10 monetary amount for this fiscal year, 2007/08; but work would proceed on the visioning
11 of a new Statewide Reference Program.

12
13 ***It was moved, seconded (Fong/Jewett) and carried unanimously that the***
14 ***Library of California Board adopts, contingent upon passage of the***
15 ***State Budget Act, the 2007/08 CLSA budget as displayed in the chart***
16 ***entitled “Summary—Recommended 2007/08 CLSA Baseline Budget by***
17 ***Program,” and that the aforementioned chart be included in the minutes***
18 ***of this meeting. (See Attachment B)***

19
20 President Maghsoudi next introduced Document 7, 2008/09 CLSA Baseline Budget
21 by Program. Habbestad pointed out that Document 7 was on the agenda as a placeholder,
22 but staff decided to table the item until the Board’s February meeting.

23
24 President Maghsoudi introduced CLSA System Plans of Service, Document 8.

25
26 Habbestad reported that the CLSA Plans of Service were received from all of the
27 fifteen Cooperative Systems. All Systems had planned to carry out the intent of the
28 CLSA law. The 49-99 Cooperative Library System had been going through a transition
29 process this year. Their administrative council had acted to terminate the joint powers
30 agreement with its members and to reestablish as an agency by joint resolution. The 49-
31 99 System has contracted with MCLS to serve as its fiscal agent and to provide

1 administrative services, effective July 1, 2007. The delivery would be continued, to be
2 provided by the Stockton/San Joaquin County Library, and for now the System would
3 rely on its members to answer most of the reference questions locally. 49-99 will use its
4 System Reference funds to support databases for member libraries.

5
6 Member Kastanis asked to clarify whether 49-99 had basically disbanded. Andersen
7 responded that 49-99 had not disbanded, but have reorganized. Hildreth then invited
8 representatives from 49-99 to comment on this issue.

9
10 Rosario Garza, 49-99 administrator, confirmed that the 49-99 Administrative Council
11 did officially disband as a joint powers agency in the spring of this year. The System has
12 gone through the process of reorganizing as a cooperative, and would continue with
13 services.

14
15 In response to a question from Member Lowenthal, Garza stated that the change
16 occurred because the City of Stockton no longer wanted to be the fiscal agent for the
17 System, as had been specified in the original JPA agreement, so 49-99 had decided to
18 look for an alternative way of organizing itself.

19
20 Andersen commented that 49-99 had received legal assistance to reorganize, and that
21 they were not the only System to be organized by Resolution by Agreement. Mountain
22 Valley, North State, and San Joaquin Valley are also formed by a Joint Resolution, which
23 has provided them more flexibility than a JPA arrangement; especially with regard to the
24 fiscal agent issue.

25
26 Member Kastanis asked for clarification as to whether the Systems that had been in
27 existence before the Library of California (LoC) were returning to the structure similar to
28 what they had prior to LoC.

29
30 Hildreth responded that all of the fifteen Systems had been around for a long time and
31 had not really changed. The regional library networks that were organized as a result of

1 the Library of California were a kind of additional layer. Some of the Systems joined
2 together in those regional networks and some did not. The Systems are undergoing a
3 natural evolution or aggregation on their own, with many under the same administrator.
4 In the case of 49-99, primarily because the City of Stockton no longer wanted to maintain
5 the role of fiscal agent, the council agreed to changed its organizational structure to have
6 more flexibility; otherwise, 49-99 probably would have stayed the same.

7
8 Andersen concluded by adding that nothing in the law states how a CLSA System
9 must be legally organized. Although the majority of systems remain under Joint Power
10 Agreements (JPAs), they have a variety of options available.

11
12 *It was moved, seconded (Zollman/Jewett) and carried unanimously that*
13 *the Library of California Board approves the CLSA Systems Plans of*
14 *Service for each of the 15 CLSA Cooperative Library Systems submitted*
15 *for fiscal year 2007/08.*

16
17 **Resource Sharing Report**

18
19 **Interlibrary Loan (ILL) and Direct Loan Programs**

20
21 President Maghsoudi introduced the agenda item for Interlibrary Loan and Direct
22 Loan Programs, Document 9, which included a revised recommended motion.

23
24 Habbestad reminded the Board that at their April meeting they had adopted the
25 2007/08 reimbursement rates for interlibrary loan at \$5.29, and direct loan at \$.97. Based
26 on those rates, and the projected increase in the number of transactions and the
27 preliminary TBR budget appropriation, staff recommended that the Board adopt,
28 contingent upon the passage of the budget act, a withholding amount of 35% from each
29 reimbursement payment throughout the fiscal year. Participants would receive 65% of
30 their total reimbursement due in quarters one through four. Any funds remaining at the
31 end of the fiscal year would be calculated proportionately and provided to participants in

1 a fifth payment. By requesting the Board to withhold the 35%, it would be factoring in an
2 additional percentage to cover unforeseen increases in transaction levels.

3
4 Member Steinhauser asked for clarification on Document 9, where it said: “For the
5 last several years the State Budget Act has not included the language requiring the Board
6 to pro-rate reimbursement payments in the event of an insufficient appropriation.” For as
7 long as she had been on the Board funds had been withheld as was thought necessary.
8 She had not realized that the Board was tied to the Budget language one way or another.

9
10 Habbestad affirmed that the Board originally had been tied to budget language, but
11 that it had been removed from the Budget Bill in fiscal year 2003/04. The pro-rating
12 language from prior budget years continued to be proposed as the more recent act of the
13 Legislature which supersedes the requirement in CLSA law that the State Board
14 reimburse at the full rate approved by the Department of Finance.

15
16 Andersen pointed out that the Department of Finance agreed with the annual survey
17 results and approved the cost to reimburse participants. However the budget
18 appropriation had not been increased to support the additional costs.

19
20 *It was moved, seconded (Cannon/Lowenthal) and carried unanimously*
21 *that the Library of California Board directs its CEO to withhold 35%*
22 *from all CLSA ILL and Direct Loan Program reimbursement payments*
23 *throughout the 2007/08 fiscal year and that, after determining the full*
24 *State cost of the remaining due to each participating library, if sufficient*
25 *funds remain, in the 2007/08 TBR Program appropriation, or to prorate*
26 *the final payment equitably, if insufficient funds remain in the program*
27 *appropriation. This motion is contingent upon passage of the State*
28 *Budget Act with a TBR appropriation of \$18,616,000.*

29
30 Andersen shared some good news concerning the TBR process. He pointed out that
31 the software that the State Library Budget Office uses to do all of the calculations for

1 TBR was not an off-the-shelf product, was incredibly complex, was old and inadequate,
2 and was in the process of being replaced by a new Windows based software program
3 capable of future modifications as needed. The State Library has contracted with a vendor
4 to write a new program. A review of the initial design document had just been completed.
5 The computer system that is currently used to calculate loan activity and reimbursement
6 is run on an outdated Windows 98 computer.

7
8 In response to a question from Member Lowenthal on the cost of the new software,
9 Andersen stated that since every public library in the state would benefit, LSTA funding
10 had been provided from a networking grant to complete this much needed project.

11
12 **CLSA System Reference Program**

13
14 Habbestad began by stating that Document 10 had been revised, reflecting corrections
15 in the sequence of all the Exhibits.

16
17 Habbestad reported that the annual approval of the System Population and
18 Membership Figures was required in order to calculate the System Reference Program
19 allocations. Exhibit A listed all the public library members for each of the CLSA
20 Systems, and the population of the System was determined by the most recently
21 published estimates from the Department of Finance. The population figures for this year
22 included the reaffiliation of Monterey Public Library with MOBAC, Moorpark City
23 Library with MCLS, Victorville Public Library with Inland; and the North State
24 population contained the entire population of Lassen Library District. In recent years,
25 only the population served by Susanville was included in North State's total.

26
27 *It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Fong) and carried unanimously that*
28 *the Library of California board approves the System Population and*
29 *Membership figures for use in the allocation of CLSA System Reference*
30 *Program funds for the fiscal year 2007/2008.*

1 Hildreth reported on the California Statewide Reference Model. She pointed out that
2 consultant Ruth Metz, who had delivered a presentation to the Board in April, has since
3 then revised her report, *California Statewide Reference: A Proposed Design*, as well as
4 the *Background Summary*. Both revised documents were included in the packet, in
5 addition to her *Proposed Design Description of Statewide Service*.

6
7 Hildreth continued that a memo, dated June 19, 2007 was sent out to the greater
8 California public library community to help assure awareness about some of the
9 considerations on the table concerning the *New Statewide Reference Model Proposal* and
10 to provide the URLs to view various materials concerning it. Andersen interjected that
11 although nearly a dozen very thoughtful responses to the June memo had been received,
12 more would be appreciated.

13
14 Hildreth expressed her sense from the responses so far received that there was a
15 general desire to move forward with the proposal in some capacity but that more detail
16 and definition were wanted. From those responding, Hildreth further stated that she
17 attended a meeting in Whittier in late June with the Boards of Santiago, MCLS and South
18 State, where a lively and optimistic discussion about the *Proposal* took place. Hildreth
19 reiterated that because of the limited capacity of the State Library to move forward on
20 this large initiative with its aggressive time-line, they were hoping to partner with MCLS
21 in an effort to find a project manager. The person hired to fill this position would most
22 likely be hired as an independent contractor to MCLS for a three year commitment.

23
24 Hildreth stated that already she and Andersen had met with some interested candidates
25 while attending the ALA Conference in Washington in late June. Subsequently, she had
26 communicated with several other candidates. Aldrich also had helped to identify some
27 candidates from other parts of the country. In fact, Statewide Reference would be one of
28 Aldrich's first big assignments. Although Hildreth had hoped that a project manager
29 would have been in place already, she assured the Board that one would be in place
30 within the next several months. And one of the first things the project manager would
31 have before him/her would be the responses from the library community.

1

2 Hildreth expressed her belief that one of the biggest concerns at the System level was
3 the use of existing resources. A lot of money was going to the Systems through the
4 Reference component and was being used for staff training and for databases, instead of
5 second level question answering. Hildreth wanted to allay concerns that the State Library
6 was going to swoop in and take away the System Reference funding. There certainly
7 might be talk about deploying System personnel, but the goal was to be strategic, to
8 leverage existing resources as much as possible, and to make sure that service was
9 functioning properly.

10

11 Hildreth informed the Board and audience of her intent to have the project manager
12 and several administrators from the State Library meet with each System. This would be
13 a time to find out what were their needs, to share the State Library's vision, and to try and
14 develop a shared vision and move forward together. She stated that nothing would
15 proceed precipitously.

16

17 Andersen added that one of the complications in finding a project manager was that
18 the job essentially required his/her presence in California for a good portion of the
19 duration of the project. Another area of concern, with respect to allocation of current
20 funding, was the issue of what could be done within the existing law. A good legal
21 review was needed. If it was found that changes to the statutes or regulations were
22 required, then additional assistance from outside the State Library most definitely would
23 be required.

24

25 Member Kastanis asked whether other states had statewide reference programs similar
26 to California's reference proposal. If there were any, which of them already had gone
27 through the process and successfully established statewide reference programs.

28

29 Andersen responded that other states had virtual reference programs in place, but
30 satisfaction was not very high. Primarily, this had to do with vendor or software issues.
31 Also, some states, unlike California, had multitype library systems where a wide variety

1 of library types were under the same funding umbrella, which adversely impacted how
2 the reference systems functioned.

3
4 Hildreth commented that a lot of states were looking at issues similar to those in
5 California. Ruth Metz researched and documented that for this proposal. Many states had
6 the 24/7 Virtual Reference kind of system, reporting various levels of success. But most
7 were not stepping back and taking a look at all the ways libraries were providing
8 information services beyond the direct public library, the academic library, or the special
9 library level, and trying to create the most strategic way to approach that. But California
10 was taking the next step and trying to be a bit more strategic than some states. Second-
11 level reference was begun in California and many states followed that; now our state was
12 going ahead to the next level.

13
14 Andersen added that the library had received confirmation from the project manager
15 interviewees, who could be regarded as experts in the reference field, that California's
16 Reference Proposal was a new and exciting approach.

17
18 Member Cannon said that this new way of providing reference service was being
19 done in academic libraries with varying levels of success. The University of San
20 Francisco was involved in a national consortium of Jesuit Colleges and Universities
21 which extended from coast to coast. When the east coast system shut down the West
22 Coast took over, and before those on the West Coast were up in the morning, the East
23 Coast would be back on-line. It required a lot of work to get this new system up and
24 running. Member Cannon was presently volunteering a member of his staff to be the
25 project manager for the national effort. It had been well received by students and faculty
26 alike.

27
28 Member Steinhauser called attention to a public comment made at the last Board
29 meeting, at which time a question was raised about whether library reference was really
30 where the intersection lay between what libraries do and what is being thought about in
31 the greater reference or information skills universe. She asked whether the right question

1 was being asked and whether the effort was being put toward the right solution. She
2 questioned whether there was preliminary work to be done before getting to the needed
3 solution? Member Steinhauser pointed out that a lot of time, marketing and money were
4 involved and wondered how staff would answer these questions.

5
6 Hildreth acknowledged Member Steinhauser’s point and said that it was certainly
7 discussed during her meeting in Whittier with the southern California systems. She
8 thought the questions were: “Are people really using libraries for information?” And,
9 “Should we be spending money on any of this at all?” She remarked that a user survey
10 had not been done that asked, “Do we really need this?” But it was a discussion that
11 should take place.

12
13 Hildreth then stated that the State Library was funded to provide some kind of second
14 or next-level reference. And even if the question volume reduced to not much at all, it
15 remained the role of the State Library to have a mechanism in place to provide that next
16 level of reference. Reference service was a primary purpose of the public library and was
17 the only way some people would ever get information. She thought it worthwhile to have
18 a system in place where those people could get the information that they needed.

19
20 Member Steinhauser commented that we do not want to be taking care of a problem
21 that does not exist, or a problem that was being otherwise answered by vendors such as
22 Google or Tutor.com. Maybe it is an issue of whether or not the private sector would pick
23 this up and pay for it and it ceased to be a public library service provided through tax
24 dollars.

25
26 Member Jewett stated that Google had become a verb. She believed that a lot of
27 people now shared the perception that if you could Google for information then you did
28 not need a library. Querying on Google yielded countless hits. But the problem with that
29 approach was in determining whether the information thus derived was correct. That was
30 what a reference librarian was trained to do; that was also a wonderful opportunity for
31 continuing the viability of the public and school library. One of the missions of libraries

1 would be to have a reference librarian who could do, and tell how to do, reliable online
2 searches. Although it would take a great deal of marketing to communicate an awareness
3 of this to the public, and to the school library world as well, she would like to see that
4 happen.

5
6 Member Cannon remarked that Member Jewett had stolen some of his thunder, as
7 basically he had wanted to say the same thing. Libraries knew how to organize, present
8 and evaluate information. The new reference model was a great direction to take in
9 meeting the needs of the typical teenager, other young people, and some of the aging
10 baby boomers who wanted information at their fingertips. Even now a user could pick up
11 a pda, surf the web, go to a library website and get an answer to a question. So, although
12 the new reference model would be a lot of work, it was moving in the right direction. He
13 agreed with Member Jewett also that it would take some very thoughtful marketing to
14 change the way people thought about what a library was and could be.

15
16 Hildreth hoped that a transparent virtual reference service alternative would be
17 provided to librarian users as well as public users and customers. She hoped that
18 reference staff sitting at reference desks with low question volume would be freed up to
19 create new service models and to be sent out by their library managers to reach out and
20 engage their community in other ways.

21
22 Member Cannon thought that Hildreth was absolutely right. Academic libraries were
23 struggling with the same thing. They realized that they needed to get out and interact with
24 students and faculty where they were on campus and to remind them that the library was
25 still a viable resource.

26
27 Hildreth agreed, but thought that libraries needed to provide services in different
28 modalities. Since librarians knew that students were not going to make a physical trip
29 over to the library if they could help it, a good virtual question answering system that
30 works for them in IM (Instant Messaging), in Chat, on their pdas, their pcs, or whatever
31 else was what the new reference model was trying to find a way to provide.

1

2 Member Kastanis said that this new way of getting information was not going to go
3 away. The impetus for it was already there and the Library of California should go along
4 with it and support it. She then went on to recount a story on the evening news about a
5 very interesting health issue with babies. In years past mothers with ill babies would go to
6 their family or to a book on the shelf that talked about what was wrong with their child.
7 But mothers were no longer doing that; instead they were going to a website. But because
8 they did not know how to use the technology and to properly evaluate the resources, they
9 were getting wrong information, and therefore misdiagnosing their babies. They said that
10 nobody had really taught them how to access reliable resources from home or wherever
11 they happened to be. Member Kastanis thought that this was what the entire reference
12 project was about: supplying information about relevant resources and their reliability
13 and authenticity.

14

15 Member Lowenthal added that the Library of California had not been ready for the
16 changes now being addressed and was therefore in the process of catching up. She hoped
17 that young folk were being used in the focus groups in order to get a sense of the future
18 so that the Board could be ready and out ahead of the game the next time around.

19

20 Hildreth hoped that what was called *digital natives* would be involved in future
21 planning. She believes that we are shifting gears because the focus was on the Library of
22 California and multitype resource sharing, including programs such as statewide
23 databases and online reference, for so long and now that funding has ceased to exist, we
24 had to regroup. Hildreth agreed that we needed to get the best ideas from all of our
25 customers, no matter what their age. She hoped that in the future a better long-term
26 strategic plan would be developed.

27

28 **CLSA System Communication and Delivery**

29

30 Habbestad addressed the Board saying that the CLSA Systems provided one of the
31 most cost-effective delivery systems in the U.S. However, the ability to meet the level of

1 delivery service required by CLSA had been severely constrained. Every year Systems
2 were contributing more local funds to meet the demand, or reducing the number of
3 delivery days per week. Since 2001, an increase of 62% was shown in the number of
4 items delivered between System members. Staff was recommending that the Board
5 consider a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) for the fiscal year 2008/09 to be submitted in
6 September to the Department of Finance. Andersen added that the BCP had yet to be
7 written and that staff was still considering how to approach it and what should be the
8 basis of justification for it. He expressed hope for the Board's approval of the BCP.

9
10 Gerry Maginnity stated that he and Habbestad had been working together on the
11 CLSA System Communication and Delivery BCP and that they were looking at historical
12 trends and trying to establish a benchmark for deliveries as well as finding what the
13 Board had supported through the years and how much money had been contributed
14 locally by Systems. The results would help to answer questions as to what the state's role
15 should be and how much funding the state should provide now.

16
17 Andersen elucidated that a BCP included, beside the classic statement of the problem,
18 several different alternatives which would be considered, and then arguments for why the
19 recommended one was the best.

20
21 Hildreth remarked that the BCP would be a confidential document until the Governor's
22 budget was issued. She did not anticipate a high likelihood of success for additional
23 funding through the BCP process, but believed that it was time to begin to frame the
24 argument for when the political climate would change. A discussion followed on the
25 meaning of the terms, "communications" and "delivery." It was confirmed that delivery
26 meant the physical delivery of materials using ground transportation, U.S. Mail, and Fed-
27 Ex. Communications consisted of telephone, the internet and email.

28
29 Hildreth said that because of the greater volume of materials being delivered and the
30 increased cost of delivering them, a rationale was being formulated to support more
31 funding. She thought the increase could be from \$1.5 million to \$3 million.

1

2 Maginnity stated that libraries all over the country were dealing with the delivery
3 issue. He attended a nationwide symposium on deliveries last year in Colorado called
4 Moving Mountains. Different local conditions resulted in widely different solutions.
5 Montana, for example, has a statewide delivery network where they are hampered with
6 weather conditions and remoteness; whereas Queens has local delivery several times each
7 day. The next level is home delivery and that was being discussed as well.

8

9 Member Kastanis thought that the State Library was exactly right to do the BCP now,
10 even though it might not be the right moment for success.

11

12 Member Jewett recommended that the BCP contain a cost breakdown and price
13 increase information, such as factoring in fuel, delivery van maintenance, insurance and
14 mail carrier costs.

15

16 Annette Milliron, North State Cooperative Library System Coordinator, thanked staff
17 for taking the delivery issue under consideration. She said that it was areas like North
18 State that really needed an infusion of money, while areas like North Bay received a lot
19 of local money because they have a large local population base, and received a good
20 portion from resource sharing. North State recently did a study about how items moved
21 through their System. If an item was out in a branch library in a rural area, such as Modoc
22 County, it might receive delivery one day each week; and it could take a book three
23 weeks to move through the North State System. These libraries simply do not have the
24 budgets to buy more days of delivery.

25

26 Member Steinhauser raised a procedural question which concerned rural libraries and
27 how best to advocate for the BCPs. Hildreth responded, saying that the library always
28 talked to CLA about the BCPs. They usually supported the Governor's budget, assuming
29 that it was not decreased. CLA would be the vehicle to get a strategy going.

30

1 *It was moved, seconded (Kastanis/Jewett) and carried unanimously that*
2 *the Library of California Board direct its Chief Executive Officer to seek*
3 *additional 2008/09 Local Assistance funding for the Systems*
4 *Communications and Delivery program.*

5

6 **CLSA System Advisory Board Program**

7

8 Habbestad explained that the annual SAB allocation provided for members to travel
9 within the System area. The motion would allow one SAB member from each System to
10 attend the CLA conference in November. It had been State Board policy to consider this
11 motion on a year by year basis.

12

13 *It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Fong) and carried unanimously that*
14 *the Library of California Board approve the use of the 2007/08 allocated*
15 *SAB Program funds where available within each approved SAB budget,*
16 *and where requested, to reimburse one SAB member from each System*
17 *for expenses incurred in attending the October 2007 California Library*
18 *Association conference to be held in Long Beach.*

19

20 **CLSA Consolidations and Affiliations**

21

22 Habbestad pointed out that this was an information item. Exhibit A provided a
23 complete history of the Consolidations and Affiliations made since CLSA was enacted in
24 1978. Exhibit B was a document from Lassen Library District which stated that the
25 district had removed the nonresident library card fee previously required from residents
26 in the unincorporated area of Lassen County.

27

28 In way of background, Andersen stated that the library had received notice almost a
29 year ago that the Susanville Library District, which previously had been confined to the
30 city limits of Susanville in Lassen County, had annexed all the rest of the unincorporated
31 areas of the county into the library district. It therefore had begun to serve all residents in

1 the county. Unfortunately, it came to our attention that residents in the unincorporated
2 areas of the county still had to pay a fee for a library card. In the CLSA law and
3 regulations it was very clear that if you participated in CLSA then the public library must
4 offer free service to its residents. The State Library received a letter from Lassen Library
5 District that they have lifted the restriction and were serving all the county residents free
6 of charge.

7

8 **Federal Legislative Issues**

9

10 Member Steinhauser reported that President Maghsoudi had signed and forwarded
11 letters on a variety of legislative issues, including support for highly qualified school
12 librarians and support for LSTA funding.

13

14 Hildreth shared with the Board that she had asked Bessie Condos, CSL staff, to assist
15 with legislative monitoring and in preparing legislative communications and letters for
16 the Board and the State Library. One of the accomplishments of Condos and the LDS
17 staff had been producing the letters that were taken to Washington in the spring for the
18 annual visit to elected officials. Those letters had described the discreet LSTA activities
19 going on in those legislator's districts. Although the letters had been a lot of work to put
20 together, their value produced good feed-back in Washington. The State Library had been
21 trying to be systematic so that the Library of California Board could go on record for
22 things that were within their legislative support policy. In one case of which Hildreth was
23 aware, a letter had been sent on behalf of the Board to Assembly Member Caballero
24 about AB 1030. The Assembly Member had been pleased to see that the Board had taken
25 a position.

26

27 Member Kastanis mentioned that letters were still one of the most important contacts
28 with legislators and members of congress. Although email was available, they still
29 preferred to get a letter in the end. President Maghsoudi added that while visiting
30 Washington, she noticed that the legislators and their staff liked seeing library projects
31 listed by their districts. It made a difference.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

Member Steinhauser reported on state legislation stating that an augmentation of \$1 million for the Public Library Fund was included in the Assembly version of the budget. The Board at its April meeting had taken a support position on a number of bills, including AB1030 (Caballero), which would expand the state’s public library literacy program to include young adults who are 16 years of age and over who are not enrolled in school so that they can improve their literacy skills.

Hildreth report that AB1030 made it out of the Assembly and the Senate and was now being reviewed by the Governor’s Office; however, all the money had been removed from the bill. State Library staff was working with the Secretary of Education’s Office, which was doing an analysis of the bill.

Member Steinhauser questioned the source of funding and whether the Governor would tap into the existing literacy programs for the funding.

Hildreth said that these types of issues would be clarified in working with the Governor’s policy analysis. The language is such that it would give us the direction or authority to focus efforts on that specific population. She did not anticipate that there would be additional funds, but neither did she expect that the Governor would ask for funds to be carved out from existing programs. She asked Jacquie Brinkley, Library Programs Consultant in Library Development Services, to speak about the service population.

Brinkley stated that those 16 to 19 years of age were the current population service group; out of school was the only designation. In researching and reviewing the records it was found that about three percent of the currently served population fell within that age group. In addressing the language in the bill to Assembly Member Caballero, best practices still could be identified, even if no monies were allotted. Literacy could become partners with the community and be good referrals for any agencies that might already be working with that age group.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

Member Steinhauser thought that one of the most interesting things about AB1033 was that it came from Assembly Member Caballero, who was formerly mayor of Salinas, California. The Assembly Member had experience with libraries and how libraries could work with at-risk youth. In fact, this was one of several bills having to do with her gang prevention kit. She appeared to see a strong correlation between literacy, education and crime. If locally elected officials were strong believers in their local libraries, then the hope would be that the same level of support would continue if they were elected to the state and even congressional levels.

Lastly, Member Steinhauser reported that the \$4 million Bond Construction Bill, SB156 (Simitian) had reached a dead end for this year. She thanked CLA and their legislative committee for actively supporting the bills.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No one from the audience rose to address the Board.

BOARD COMMENT

Member Lowenthal introduced the subject of the *California Speaks* program by referring to an email about the Health Care bills that Hildreth sent out on the CALIX listserv. Hildreth said that it concerned the public domain and was not really advocating any particular position on bills. The State Library was suggesting that individual libraries might want to sponsor a public webcast debate.

Member Kastanis discussed the issue of joint use facilities. Many positive things had gone on in the past with ‘shared use’ and ‘joint use’ projects. She asked whether anyone would be reporting on that past history or the new projects that had been going on within the past year.

1 Hildreth pointed out that some Proposition 14 buildings had been opened. A limited
2 number were actually shared use facilities. Many had joint use agreements. No plan had
3 been devised and put in place to survey how those shared use arrangements were going.
4

5 Member Kastanis continued that school districts were talking about the whole idea of
6 joint use facilities with public libraries. She wondered what kind of information could be
7 given to those districts to get an idea as to whether they had been successful or not.
8 Perhaps a survey would be appropriate for those actively in place right now.
9

10 Condos stated that a survey had been done in either 2000 or 2001. It went to all public
11 library directors with the intent of getting a handle on joint use, to see who had it and
12 how it was working. A list had been developed at the time but she was not sure whether it
13 had been kept up-to-date.
14

15 Hildreth said that it would be taken under consideration to see how a survey could be
16 done. She would like to see how joint use had been working generally, but especially just
17 how it had been working in some of the Bond Act Programs.
18

19 Member Lowenthal expressed delight in the new staff members, Aldrich and Morris;
20 and thanked staff for the work in producing the background information for the Board
21 packet.
22

23 Member Jewett thanked staff for all of their work. She was pleased that the Board
24 would be having two meetings per year. She was excited about the development of the
25 proposed reference model.
26

27 Member Battle welcomed the new staff, congratulated Habbestad, and thanked
28 everyone.
29

30 Member Steinhauser said that she had been on the Board for more than ten years and
31 she remarked how the library community had grown. Barbara Will's loss made her

1 realize just how much had been accomplished. She realized just how important the public
2 library work was, even though there were many who had alleged that with the arrival of
3 the electronic age there really was not a place for libraries any longer. Everyone had been
4 proving that that was absolutely false. There really was more work to be done. She was
5 delighted to see that Hildreth was getting the kind of assistance she needed. Until Senate
6 Rules asked her to step down, she was looking forward to continuing her service on the
7 Board.

8

9 Member Fong concurred with everything that had been said by the other Members in
10 closing. She welcomed the new members to the staff and congratulated the new officers.
11 She also said that she had been able to visit several libraries from the good work from the
12 Bond Act. Like Member Steinhauser, she also was one of the old workhorses on the
13 Board. She welcomed the change of new staff and new ideas. Under new leadership the
14 focus was on some very relevant and important issues.

15

16 Member Cannon added his welcome to the new staff and thanked the staff at the State
17 Library for all of there support. He said that it was nice to be able to come up to
18 Sacramento for the twice yearly meetings.

19

20 Member Zollman welcomed the new folks to the State Library. She thanked Hildreth
21 and President Maghsoudi for all of the hard work on their parts. As the newest Member
22 she said that she was still on a learning curve and appreciated the patience shown to her
23 and the answers to her questions. Because she worked in public libraries and schools, she
24 was excited about the Skills Act. It was really pitiful that middle schools did not have a
25 librarian in place. She visited one recently where the books were from the sixties and
26 were racist, sexist and horrible. Considerable time was spent pulling them off the shelves.
27 But more importantly, nobody in that library was trained. Kids were going off to high
28 school with very few library and research skills. She favored anything the Board could do
29 to help make that happen. Concerning AB1030, having worked with Adult and Family
30 Literacy, it was very critical to get young people into libraries and education programs.
31 While working with the juvenile court system in Oakland, a judge there had been very

1 successful specifically working with youth who had been first-time offenders. Member
2 Zollman would like to see the Board model on something similar.

3

4 President Maghsoudi welcomed Aldrich and looked forward to working with her. She
5 extended an open invitation to come visit her library in southern California. She thanked
6 everyone for supporting her during the three years of her Board Presidency. She had
7 really enjoyed her term and found it to be a great learning experience.

8

9 Member Kastanis expressed thanks to President Maghsoudi.

10

11 President Maghsoudi mentioned that the Agenda Building item would be put together
12 for the Board at the next meeting in February. Hildreth said that the State Library would
13 work on Member Kastanis's suggestion of joint use.

14

15 ***It was moved, seconded (Lowenthal/Fong) and carried unanimously that***
16 ***the Library of California Board adjourn its business meeting of August 8,***
17 ***2007 at 11:48 a.m. in memory of Barbara Will.***

18

19

###

Library of California Board Resolution 2007-03

WHEREAS, on July 8, 2007, the Library of California Board, California State Library and the library community was saddened by the sudden loss of one of its dedicated colleagues, Barbara Will; and

WHEREAS, the Library of California Board wishes to express its heart-felt sympathy to her husband, Gerry Bowers, and Barbara's family; and

WHEREAS, the Board, staff, and library colleagues throughout California and beyond will always remember Barbara as an intelligent and gracious professional who began her career in Library Development Services in 1987 as she coordinated networking activities throughout the state and facilitated the meetings of the California Multitype Library Networking Task Force which led to the enactment in 1998 of SB 409, the Library of California Act; and

WHEREAS, Barbara was nationally known as an expert on the federal Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA), advocating for its reauthorization, and for the most beneficial funding appropriation for California from Congress; and

WHEREAS, the Board wishes to acknowledge Barbara for developing several very successful LSTA targeted grant programs, noticeably the Library Services to People with Disabilities program and the Library Services to Small Business program; and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that

*the Library of California Board
extends its sincere sympathy and deep regard to
the family of*

BARBARA WILL

*for her distinguished leadership and contributions
to the libraries and people of the State of California
on this day of 8 August 2007*

SUMMARY—RECOMMENDED 2007/08 CLSA BASELINE BUDGET BY PROGRAM

PROGRAM	2006/07 CLSA BASELINE BUDGET	2007/08 ADJUSTMENTS	RECOMMENDED 2007/08 CLSA BASELINE BUDGET
Transaction Based Reimbursements	\$ 18,616,000	-0-	\$ 18,616,000
Consolidations & Affiliations	-0-	-0-	-0-
Statewide Data Base	-0-	-0-	-0-
System Advisory Boards	27,260	-0-	27,260
System Reference	1,608,340	-0-	1,608,340
System Communications & Delivery	1,090,400	-0-	1,090,400
System Planning, Coordination, & Evaluation	-0-	-0-	-0-
Statewide Communications & Delivery	-0-	-0-	-0-
State Reference Centers	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	\$21,342,000	-0-	\$21,342,000